HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 18 Saturday, May 4, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
STEVENS POINT, WISCONSIN

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

The Irrepressible Conflict I: Among the many commentaries on the career of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, few have explored his crucial role in the 150-year-old "irrepressible conflict" between the Executive and the Legislature.

The Senator constantly asserted the right and duty of the Legislature and its committees to seek out evidences of wrongdoing in the Executive arm. His efforts, however, were often obscured by the shrill cries of his critics about "witch hunts," "one-man committees," "star chamber proceedings," faceless informers," "guilt by association," "book burning," etc.

Few people now, or then, could brush aside nonessentials and get to the root of the McCarthy crusade as did former Senator Burton K. Wheeler (Democrat, Montana). From the days when he prosecuted the Teapot Dome scandals of 1924-25, Wheeler knew full well the historically necessary task of Congressional committees. At the time of the Army-McCarthy hearings, Wheeler told HUMAN EVENTS (June 2, 1954): "When Senator Tom Walsh, my colleague from Montana, and myself prepared to reveal the fraudulent giving away of our oil resources by a member of the Cabinet, we would have had a virtually impossible task in gathering data without the same sort of informants from within the Executive arm, as Eisenhower now condemns . . . This issue of the right of Congress to receive information from officials in the Executive arm of the Government is precious, of the highest importance. The Congress has the constitutional right and duty to check on what goes on in the Executive branch and to receive such information. Without this, Congressional investigations would be crippled. It is disturbing that the President and so many people fail to realize this."

Looking backward only three years, it seems almost incredible that Attorney General Brownell claimed that McCarthy was upsetting the constitutional distribution of powers between the Executive and Congress — and that, in effect, the Executive arm was answerable only to itself. Those were the days, in 1954, of interminable lofty sermons by bureaucrats on the sanctity of "separation of powers."

In these days of 1957, when a bipartisan majority of Congress strives to limit the unwieldy growth of the Executive, as typified by the controversial Budget, it is almost forgotten that three years ago, McCarthy, almost single-handed, tried to establish the true role of Congress under the tripartite division of Governmental powers: to counteract the tendency of the Executive to absorb every function of Government and to become a law unto itself. "The separation of powers," the Senator knew, existed for the purpose of "checks and balances."

In a real sense, McCarthy, who never recovered from the shock and exhaustion of the Army-McCarthy hearings — his final crisis — was a casualty of that constitutional struggle.

The Irrepressible Conflict II: In the past 48 hours, events have been shaping up to an all-out collision between the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government.

The Congress has returned from its recess, after no little canvassing by members of their constituencies on the big issue of the day — economy in Government. From all accounts, the answer of the constituents to their representatives indicates that the public desire for cutting the Budget is at least as strong as ever, in some places much stronger than before. The expectation is that this sentiment will increase.

Since most members of Congress believe the public demand on this matter is soundly based, signs point to both Houses resisting demands by the Executive to pass the Budget as presented, or to restore cuts already made.

The Executive arm seems to be intent on substantially maintaining the Budget level; and the bureaucrats (the real authors of the Budget) are briefed to defend the case before committees of House and Senate. Eisenhower may take his case by TV to the mass of the people.

What are the prospects? On the one hand (1) it is thought that the President will only make a show of force to satisfy demands of Eastern "liberal" metropolitan papers that he press his "modern Republican" program; that he isn't well enough really to put pressure on Congress personally, in private conferences, and to go through all the work involved; that, in the end, the Executive arm will gradually submit to the Legislative.

(2) On the other hand, others believe that neither side will yield and that there will take place what one high GOP personality on Capitol Hill called "a real knock-down-and-drag-out struggle" lasting

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until the end of the session, with a very debatable final score. The political landscape might look a great deal different after such a fight — which could prove historic.

Along Diplomatic Row: One threat to our new-found friend King Hussein of Jordan (which has not yet been noticed in print) is that fast jet plane in which he visited Saudi Arabia last week end. The big danger to Hussein, according to well-informed diplomats, is that Soviet agents may plant in it a time-bomb or in some way sabotage the machinery. Hussein insists on piloting the plane. The young king is well guarded by Bedouin tribesmen and his enemies are seeking less direct methods of getting rid of him. His death would probably bring down the whole shaky edifice of the Transjordanian Government; and it is recalled that his father, King Abdullah, died by assassination in July of 1951.

(It is understood that Nasser of Egypt and Kuwatly of Syria also fear assassination and are on their guard.)

● While the dispatch of the Sixth Fleet to the Eastern Mediterranean helped turn the tide against communism in Arabia in last week's crisis, some sources here believe that the decisive factor was supplied by Turkey, whose Government sent two divisions to the Syrian border as the crisis developed. "What scared the Arabs more than the approach of the Sixth Fleet," wrote Constantine Brown, Foreign Editor of the Washington *Star*, "was the presence of a couple of Turkish divisions on the Syrian border. These could 'arrest' the Syrian army as soon as Ankara decided that intervention to preserve the status quo was essential for peace in the Middle East." It is believed that Ankara notified Washington of its decision to send the divisions, and Washington heartily approved.

Indeed, Turkey — rather than the Eisenhower Doctrine — emerges as the possible savior of the situation in the Middle East, as some along diplomatic row view it. There is, of course, no possibility of the revival of the Ottoman Empire (from which the Arabs were liberated). But perhaps Ankara — both diplomatically and militarily — might come forward as a sort of "big brother" of the Moslems in the Middle East. It is an interesting fact that Hussein's new Premier, Ibrahim Hashem, is a Turk by race. He was, of course, like many Arabs, born under Ottoman Turk rule in the era before World War I. A power like Turkey, with no links or sympathy with Zionism, might indeed take the lead and save the day in the Middle East. So at least runs one thread of speculation in diplomatic quarters in Washington.

● Foreign diplomats who have been here long and know what goes on in Washington express amazement that President Eisenhower fails to consult the one big "hush hush" agent of the U.S. Government — J. Edgar Hoover. The chief of the F.B.I., who gathers precious information not only at home but also from foreign sources, could have, if consulted, steered Ike away from the thorny Canadian situation arising from the death of that country's Ambassador to Cairo. Hoover is well known the world over as one of the greatest authorities on Communist subversion.

Yet the fact is that Ike has not consulted Hoover for nearly two years. In contrast, Franklin D. Roosevelt — although he frequently ignored Hoover's warnings — nevertheless thought it necessary to have a session with the head of the F.B.I. at least once a month.

Government by Grin: Around the Capital clubs, the pundits are saying that the GOP tries to conceal its internal division by a grin — or rather, by a former General with a grin — and that the Democrats seek to cover up their much more severe internal convulsions by a "crew-cut kid with a grin." That is popular Senator Jack Kennedy, whom the *decor* designers of the Democratic front have chosen to divert public contemplation from the truly appalling splits in that party.

As everyone in Washington knows, a big build-up of the youthful and attractive Senator from Massachusetts is under way. But as no one (for some reason) will publicly emphasize, the build-up reeks of Madison Avenue techniques — such as the well-timed appearance of the crew-cut on the cover of magazines; feature articles and "profiles" in a dozen periodicals; sudden casting of the young man in the role of an expert on all members of the Senate from Clay to Taft; and, of course, the book, *Profiles of Courage*, authored by the Senator, with the aid of perhaps three or four researchers. Who pays the bills?

Probably not the hard up Democratic Party. It is widely believed that the wealthy father of the Senator endowed each of his children with about a million dollars. Therefore "young Jack" could be footing the bill himself, although — some suggest — Kennedy *père* may also help out, with both boys. Both? The talk of the town is that Robert Kennedy, counsel for the McClellan Labor Committee, hopes to use the committee room as a springboard for running for the governorship of Massachusetts.

Perhaps the CIO would help him to that honor. For the story is getting around among those who watch closely the proceedings of the McClellan Committee that he is inclined to go softly on CIO leaders and harshly (what if McCarthy had done such bullying?) with AFL chieftains Beck and Hoffa, who have been on friendly political terms with the GOP. Unless the "liberal" Reuthers and Careys get their grilling soon, Bob Kennedy will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be classified as a "lib lab." And this label can all too easily rub off on the Senator brother, who — by the way — is not so far removed from Adlai and Estes as Madison Avenue would like the public to believe.

For despite the build-up of Senator Kennedy as a "moderate," his voting record in the last session of the 84th Congress shows that actually he's a pretty faithful follower of the political line laid down by the socialistic left-wing Americans for Democratic Action (ADA). The *ADA World* (August 1956) summarized the record of all members of Congress and its chart illustrates vividly the association of Kennedy with that organization's views. On ADA's selection of 14 "key" issues or bills, Senator Kennedy followed the ADA line on 12 of the 14. That's a pretty high score, close to the socialist Senator Paul Douglas, who voted ADA on all the 14 issues. By contrast, Kennedy's colleague from Massachusetts, Senator Saltonstall (often chided as a rather "liberal" Republican) voted the ADA line on only 4 of the 14.

In short, in defying the blackmail of the socialists, the rather timid Saltonstall cuts a "profile of courage" as compared with young Kennedy. In view of the obvious fact that the country is becoming more anti-New Deal and anti-labor bosses, the young man with the grin, in the opinion of veteran observers here, will fade like the Cheshire cat unless he alters his voting trend.

And, it is added, the Democratic GHQ had better put Madison Avenue to work on someone like Lyndon Johnson or Frank Lausche — if they hope to survive in 1960.

Giveaway Front: The so-called "new look" proposed for American foreign aid programs, in which "loans" are to be substituted for "gifts," is branded in the Capital as a device to convince economy-minded legislators that somehow America will recover its billions in foreign aid grants.

Under Secretary Dulles' new proposal, "loans" will be extended to foreign nations in the form of American dollars — which, as a "hard" and readily convertible currency, are everywhere sought after as a means of exchange. When our "loans," are "repaid," however, they will not be repaid in dollars, but in "soft" currencies such as rupees, dinars, bahts, kyats, and rials — at an unrealistic official rate of exchange. These "repayments" will generally purchase "goods" (i.e., build new embassies and pay the local expenses of junketeering American officials) only in the countries where the soft curriencies are printed. After that, because the exchange rates effectively bar purchases by American importers, they will buy nothing. Thus, say the monetary experts, these loans will never really be repaid, and are just another form of giveaway.

Atomic Energy: The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is slated to start hearings next week on the International Atomic Energy Agency Treaty. The pact's going promises to be rough, with little chance that it will be ratified in its present form.

Few Senators knew anything about the Treaty's provisions when President Eisenhower submitted it for ratification in March, but they have been doing their homework on it in the interim; many object to such provisions as the following:

Materials financing: Most of the Agency's fissionable materials would come from the United States; the U.S. would furnish 5,000 kilograms of nuclear fuel (A.E.C. value: $125 million) at the outset, and then match material contributions by other nations.

Materials distribution: The nuclear fuel would be sent anywhere in the world at the discretion of the Board of Governors — representing 21 nations. The U.S. would have one of those 21 votes.

Materials control: Again, in the hands of the Board of Governors; there is no provision for the United States to recapture any materials it believes are being misused, or to have more than its 1/21 voice in their distribution, use and control.

Membership: Any nation in the world, Communist or otherwise, can be elected to membership, by a simple majority vote of the Board of Governors and the General Conference (one representative from every member nation). The Agency is carefully set up outside the United Nations so that there can be no veto. There is no bar to Red China's admission.

And many others. Much more will be heard about this one as it travels its Senate path.

Civil Rights: Present Capitol cloakroom estimate on the Administration's so-called "civil rights" bill: to pass the House in late May or early June, but probably not even brought up in the Senate this year and easily filibustered to early death if it is.

The unanimous opinion around the Capitol is that one of the smartest moves yet by opponents of the bill is Senator John McClellan's offering of a "right-to-work" amendment during the bill's present consideration by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The civil rights bill has been made the committee's pending order of business, and there is no doubt that, if it ever comes to a vote, it will be approved.

But the guesses are now that the committee first will write into the bill McClellan's amendment. Eight of the Judiciary Committee's 15 members are expected to vote for the amendment: Southern Democrats Eastland, McClellan, Johnston and Ervin, and Republicans Jenner, Butler, Hruska and Watkins. The last-named would be expected to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vote "no," because of his strong "modernism," except that his home state, Utah, likes the "right-to-work" law it has on its own statute books, and Watkins is up for re-election next year; to vote against it would weaken his chances of success.

McClellan's move assures that if the bill ever reaches the Senate floor, members will be called upon to answer a roll call on the amendment's adoption. It will be most embarrassing to "liberals"; should they go on record as saying the "right to work" is not a constitutional right to be guaranteed by Federal law, or should they vote for it despite the violent opposition of union bosses?

One effect of this looming embarrasment probably will be to discourage some members, at least, from voting for "cloture" to shut off debate and assure a vote at a certain time — to stop a filibuster.

Education Front: In a heavily documented House speech last week, Representative Ralph W. Gwinn (R.-N. Y.) turned a strong spotlight on the railroading tactics of the Federal Aid to Schools lobby. "The Government," Gwinn charged, "is the chief propagandist for Federal Aid" — assisted by such "natural satellites" as the NEA. In testimony on the school construction bill, he continued, "the voice of the people" rang out in protest against this concentrated lobbying by Big Government, the professional educationists, and the AFL-CIO.

Gwinn quoted extensively from the authoritative statements as to need, rate of school construction, and public mistrust placed before the committee by witnesses opposed to Federal aid. Such anti-Federal Aid testimony, he pointed out, was ignored. In one instance, a witness testifying as to the needs of the state of Oklahoma was subjected to such hostile questioning that he was unable to finish his statement.

Then, Gwinn stated, the House Education subcommittee, "before the testimony was printed, and without studying the testimony and reading the statements filed, reported out a $2 billion Federal aid to school construction bill to be acted upon by the whole committee."

Many in the Capital compare Gwinn's House speech, outlining the pressures for Federal Aid and the public protest against it, with a recent study by the Washington research organization, *Congressional Quarterly*. In its *Weekly Report* for April 19, *CQ* listed the organizations lobbying for and against Federal aid to schools legislation. Whereas 32 organizations were listed as lobbying for Federal Aid, only 10 were listed against it. Leading the fight for Federal Aid are such groups as the AFL-CIO, the NEA, the PTA, the ADA, and the NAACP. Leading opponents are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Legion, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Tallying the total membership of the organizations on either side, CQ notes that proponents of Federal Aid outnumber their opposition about five to one—27 million to 6 million. Observers point out, however, that these figures are hardly an index to public opinion about Federal Aid; for the two groups which make up the bulk of the pro-Federal Aid forces, AFL-CIO (15 million) and PTA (10 million) are precisely those groups whose leaders have been frequently accused of disregarding the sentiments of their mass memberships, and of dictating policies from the top down.

From Socialism to Sound Money: With Sir William Beveridge, it used to be "From the Cradle to the Grave"; now it's "From Socialism to Sound Money." Beveridge (now Lord Beveridge), back in 1942 when he was "Sir William," unveiled his comprehensive plan of social security — which was protection of everyone "from the cradle to the grave" from the hazards of ill health, unemployment and old age. His philosophy of the "welfare state" had great effects on world rulers from British Socialist Premier Attlee to President Eisenhower. Therefore, it is news today that Beveridge now is aware that something went wrong since 1942 and that he finds the big danger not "social insecurity" but rather "funny money."

Charles B. Lucey of the Scripps-Howard papers recently reported on the Beveridge situation. The famous man, it seems, retired as president of one of Oxford's colleges in 1945 and took his pension in cash. Today, Beveridge is interested in the fact that now the value of each pound sterling is not 20 shillings but five. Something has happened since 1945. It is inflation.

The noble Lord is still in favor of social insurance, but now realizes that the state must "maintain the value of money." He is writing a book on inflation down the ages and makes the point that the present inflation differs from that of other epochs in that today a big factor in creating inflation is the labor union movement. Trade union pressure for steadily higher wages has a lot to do with it, he says. The answer, according to this British welfare state liberal, is "increasing productivity," which sounds very much like that old reactionary, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey.

"Money," Beveridge told Lucey, is "the basis of liberty." He continued: "It is a condition of liberty which lets the individual plan his own life. For some it may be only the liberty to spend it or blow it in. But a prime duty of the state, if it wants to insure freedom, is to maintain the value of money. What's the purpose of saving if your money will be no good?"

Book Front: Alger Hiss' book, *Court of Public Opinion* (Alfred A. Knopf; $5.00), will be published this week. Those interested in reading Hiss' attempt to vindicate himself may obtain a copy of the book, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y. So that everyone will have access to both sides of the Hiss story, The Bookmailer offers, to all purchasers of the Hiss book, a free copy of Whittaker Chambers' *Witness*.

Letter from ROBERT A. MAGOWAN, Chairman of the Board, Safeway Stores: "HUMAN EVENTS provides an expression of opinion on national affairs which happens to coincide usually with my own political views. I'm delighted there is such a voice in this wilderness of crackpots and so-called liberals."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 18 HUMAN EVENTS May 4, 1957

Article Section I

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

FROM LINCOLN TO EISENHOWER

Big Government Replaces States' Rights

By SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

ABRAHAM LINCOLN is now being quoted by President Eisenhower in support of numerous "New Republican" recommendations for concentrating more and more power in the Federal Government.

The quotation is as follows: "The legitimate object of government is 'to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well for themselves.' "

Lincoln wrote these words on July 1, 1854. At that time, he was not an officer of any government, Federal, state or local. He was not justifying any proposed expansion of governmental power at any level. His use of the word "government" had no reference to the Federal Government. He was thinking of any kind of government, local, state or national, and American or foreign, ancient or modern.

President Eisenhower repeats Lincoln's words as Chief Executive to bolster his views as to what the *Federal* Government should "do for the people."

Thus used, the quotation wipes out all constitutional limitations on the power of the Federal Government to act. No centralized authoritarian government in the world has ever claimed a broader assumption of power than this statement, thus applied and interpreted.

Did our first Republican President give these words any such construction or application?

The prestige of Lincoln is so great that, in fairness to his memory, and to the truth, his use of these words needs to be explored.

They appear in a short "Fragment on Government," dated July 1, 1854, and can be found in both the *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln,* (Nicolay and Hay, editors), and the *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln,* (Roy P. Besler, editor).

According to the editors, the original of this "Fragment" cannot be found. It appears to have been some rough notes on a proposed lecture Lincoln was turning over in his mind, but there is no record that he ever gave a lecture or made a speech incorporating these words. No question is here raised that the quotation is not authentic, but there is no evidence that Lincoln ever uttered or wrote it as his deliberate view of the "legitimate object of government." No one who has ever made rough notes on a proposed speech which he did not use would claim them to be authoritative, even if they escaped the wastebasket.

In both reference works, it appears that Lincoln made two slightly different drafts of his thoughts, both supposedly on the same date. In one, the words "to do for the people" to the end of the sentence is given in quotation marks as if he were quoting someone else. In the other, the quotation marks are omitted. There are other small differences in the two texts.

As part of the same "Fragment" Lincoln spoke of "crimes, misdemeanors and nonperformance of contracts" as things government should handle, rather than individual persons taking the law into their own hands. He further illustrated his thought by speaking of other things "which in their nature, and without wrong, require combined action, as public roads and highways, public schools, charities, pauperism, orphanages and estates of the deceased."

IT IS PLAIN, with respect to nearly all of these items, that the word "government" had reference to local and state governments, not to the Federal Government.

Lincoln was one of a relatively few Presidents who ever really studied the Constitution of the United States. He knew that "the legitimate objects of [the Federal] government" were limited; that it has *no legitimate* power to "do for the people" beyond the powers granted it, and that, as set forth in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, "the powers *not* delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This separation of governmental powers between the states and the Nation was once known

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to every school boy. Time and again, from Chief Justice Marshall to Chief Justice Hughes, the United States Supreme Court has said that the wisdom or desirability of either Federal or state legislation "to do for the people" was not for the Court to decide, but simply whether the power to legislate in any particular matter had been delegated to the Nation, or was reserved to the States or to the people.

Marshall, who saw the need of a strong central Government, nevertheless wrote: "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and compounding the American people into one common mass."

Justice Hughes, in deciding the Schechter "sick chicken" case, by which N.R.A.'s "Blue Eagle" died, said "It is not the province of the Court to consider the economic advantages or disadvantages of such a centralized system. It is sufficient to say that the Federal Constitution does not provide for it." (295 U.S. 495.)

Indeed, the Declaration of Independence complained that King George III and his advisers had "suspended our own Legislatures and declared themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever."

Lincoln not only knew these principles of government but aligned himself with them, not against them. He would preserve them, not destroy them. Lincoln was a Jeffersonian, not a Hamiltonian. He said, in 1859: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society . . . It is now no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this nation."

In 1858 Lincoln said, "the general (or Federal) government, upon principle, has no right to interfere with anything other than that general class of things that does concern the whole."

That same year, in a debate with Douglas, he said: "The variety in the soil and climate of the country, and the consequent variety in the industrial pursuits and productions of a country require a system of laws conforming to the variety in the natural features of the country."

LINCOLN'S STRONG CRITICISM of the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision was based on his belief that Illinois law and not Federal law determined Scott's status. Scott was not a fugitive slave. He had been brought by his master to Illinois, a free State, where he lived for two years. His master therefore had voluntarily subjected Scott to Illinois law, and so, under the principle that whoever "breathes free air becomes a free man," Lincoln held that Scott was no longer a slave, the Supreme Court to the contrary notwithstanding. This was as strong an assertion of States' Rights as can be found.

After Lincoln had been elected President he wrote: "The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States and especially of the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection of our political fabric depends."

This was a restatement of a plank in the Republican platform of the previous summer upon which Lincoln had been elected. "The maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must be preserved."

Such were the views of our first Republican President as to the legitimate objects of government, and of what objects are entrusted to which government.

As there are frequent occasions when the views of the President and Congress as to what "needs to be done for the people" conflict with what the governors, legislatures or people of the States think should be done for them — *or not done to them* — it is necessary to have a rule book to decide who does what.

That rule book is the Constitution of the United States.

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

The Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, author, lecturer, and radio commentator, was a Member of Congress from Indiana, 1931-39. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Bipartisanship is Subverting the Constitution," February 18, 1956.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 18 HUMAN EVENTS May 4, 1957

Article Section II

WHY ROME FELL

The Effects of Bureaucracy, Taxes and Inflation

OF THE MANY problems that faced Diocletian*, one of the most acute was that of inflation which was effected by the debasement of the currency. For centuries the Roman coinage was fundamentally sound, resting as it did upon the intrinsic value of the standard silver coin, the denarius, which was worth about 22 cents U.S.A. of 1950. To provide for his extravagant expenditures, Nero was the first to resort to inflation, by reducing the weight of the denarius and lowering its precious metal content, thus diminishing its value to about 90 or 95 percent of its earlier worth.

Succeeding Emperors, when faced with financial difficulties, especially in time of war, resorted to the same expedient, since paper money and government bonds were entirely unknown. Thus shortly after 256, in the period of military anarchy, "silver" coins had lost about 75 per cent of their earlier value and ultimately 98 per cent, since such coins now had only a slight silver wash that was applied to a base metal. The government issued sackloads of such coins, known as folles (*follis,* sack), whose value was so slight that they passed from hand to hand unopened. The gold coinage remained pure but the coins became smaller and smaller until finally they were accepted only by weight. Such inflation ruined great numbers of the middle classes by wiping out their savings.

During the period of the military anarchy a complicated system of taxation gradually developed. Since taxes were paid in the debased coinage of the time, State revenues fell off to such an extent that the Emperors first attempted to cope with the situation by raising taxes, until in the time of Aurelian in 275 they were eight times as high as they had previously been.

*Emperor of Rome, 284 - 305 A.D.

Since the increase in the tax rate failed to keep pace with inflation, the Emperors refused to accept payment in their own debased coinage and they resorted to a wasteful system of taxation in kind, especially of farm products, which was known as the annona. This was done in order that the State could be sure of being able to pay its soldiers and other members of the imperial service who were now granted subsistence allowances, annonae, instead of the previous payments in money. Only under Diocletian and Constantine was any semblance of order restored to the imperial financial system, but the economically wasteful annona and other oppressive features of the tax system were continued until the fall of the Empire in the West.

IN THE FINANCIAL system as reorganized by Diocletian and further perfected by Constantine, the tax burdens on all classes became very heavy. As a means of safeguarding the prompt payment of taxes and the performances of the various public services, on which the very existence of the State depended, the entire population was completely regimented, with a rigor that it had never known before. The wealthy classes, who also held the higher offices in the bureaucracy, prospered in general, but the condition of the masses or plebeians grew steadily worse.

Most of the country plebeians were reduced to the condition of coloni or tenant farmers, a form of serfdom, in which they and their descendants were forever bound to the soil, with no hope of bettering their condition. The city plebeians were more fortunate in that they were assisted by doles of food and amused by shows at public expense, but they too were strictly

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regimented by the socialized State and were conscripted for service whenever their labor was needed.

In addition to the annona or burdens on the land, many other tax payments were levied. Every trade and business was compelled to pay a money tribute that was known as the lustral tax, since it was assessed every five years. Customs dues and transit dues were exacted as a toll on all merchandise that was transported from one place to another, and even the privileged classes were compelled to make stated payments of gold, silver, and various commodities. In addition to his taxes, every citizen was compelled to contribute various services that were known as *munera*.

Wealthier citizens must make contributions of gold, that were known as offertories or free-will offerings to the Emperor. At their own expense they were compelled to furnish shows and other forms of amusement to the populace. They were conscripted for unremunerated services of many kinds, such as tax collections, magistracies in the municipalities, supervision of various public enterprises, such as the public post, and the furnishing of recruits for the army. Owners of houses were compelled to share their homes with soldiers and imperial officials who were quartered upon them.

Similarly, the lower classes or plebeians were required to perform the more menial tasks that were imposed upon them. Farmers were compelled to haul their tax payments, often for long distances, to the great warehouses of the State. Whenever their services were needed, the plebeians were conscripted for labor, both skilled and unskilled, such as the building and repair of roads, bridges, and other public works, the collection, transport, and preparation of adequate food supplies for the army and for the city populace, the furnishing of draft animals, provender, wagons and carriages for the public post, the burning of lime and charcoal, and the furnishing of wood and lumber for public needs, to mention only a few of the burdens that the socialized State imposed upon its citizens.

THE IMPERIAL bureaucracy, as established by Diocletian, became increasingly corrupt with passing time. In spite of the many earnest attempts of the succeeding Emperors to remedy the abuses and to protect the people against oppression, the bureaucratic officeholders were always able to thwart the good intentions of their apparent masters. Under one pretext or another the bureaucracy was able to extort an even larger amount of taxes and other services, until the burden of supporting the great army of government employees became intolerable, and the mass of Roman taxpayers welcomed the invading barbarians and a reversion to more primitive forms of life and government.

Thus fell the Roman Empire of the West. Many other causes materially contributed to its final disintegration and to the triumph of the barbarians, but the most important single cause was unquestionably the hopeless misery of the regimented masses, with the attendant economic collapse that resulted from the excessive taxation that was necessary to support a corrupt bureaucracy of the socialized State.

This article is an extract from *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*, a translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography by Clyde Pharr; Princeton University Press. $20.00. Reprinted by permission of the publishers.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101 Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. *It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a* 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED